

REMARKS

Claims 1-4, 6-14, 22-24, 26, 28-33, 35, 48-50, 56-63, and 65 are currently under consideration. Applicants cancel, without prejudice, claims 48-49. Applicants add new claim 74. Support for the subject matter of this claim can be found throughout the specification. For example, support can be found in previously pending claim 22. No new matter has been entered. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks. Issues raised by the Examiner will be addressed below in the order they appear in the prior Office Action.

1. Claims 48 and 49 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as allegedly being a substantial duplicate of claims 60 and 63. Applicants traverse this rejection.

To expedite prosecution, Applicants have cancelled claims 48 and 49. Cancellation of claims 48 and 49 is not in acquiescence to the objection. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this objection are requested. Applicants' cancellation of claims 48 and 49 is believed to place claims 60 and 63 in condition for allowance.

2-3. Claims 22-24, 26, 28-33, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to enable one of skill in the art to practice the claimed invention. Applicants traverse this rejection to the extent it is maintained in light of the amended claims.

The Office Action alleges that, although enabling for methods of preventing restenosis, the specification fails to enable methods of treating restenosis. In raising this rejection, the Examiner has failed to cite any authority that would lead one of skill in the art to question the scope of enablement. As such, Applicants contend that there is no basis for maintaining this rejection.

Nevertheless, to expedite prosecution of claims directed to commercially relevant subject matter, Applicants have amended claim 22 to more particularly point out that the claimed method is a method of preventing restenosis. Applicants' amendment is not in acquiescence to the rejection. Applicants reserve the right to prosecute claims of similar or differing scope. Applicants' amendment is believed to obviate the rejection, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is requested. In light of Applicants' amendment, claims 22-24, 26, 28-33, and 35 are believed to be in condition for allowance.

4. Applicants note with appreciation that the Examiner has indicated that claims 1-4, 6-14, 50, 56-59, 61, 62, and 65 are in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully solicited. The Examiner may address any questions raised by this submission to the undersigned at 617-951-7000. Should an extension of time be required, Applicants hereby petition for same and request that the extension fee and any other fee required for timely consideration of this submission be charged to **Deposit Account No. 18-1945, under Order No. HYDR-P01-002.**

Date: January 10, 2006

Respectfully Submitted,



Melissa S. Rones
Reg. No. 54,408
Ropes & Gray LLP
One International Place
Boston, MA 02110
Phone: 617-951-7000
Fax: 617-951-7050